

Witney Meeting's A. Book<sup>3</sup>

A

No 41

# DEFENCE

Of the BOOK Entituled

**Cerinthus and Ebion :**

OR, THE

*Heresy of Tything*, under the Gospel,  
DETECTED, &c.

Against the Exceptions of an haughty, ignorant  
DIALOGUE, between (as not for want of the Vanity  
of Self-Opinion they term themselves) *Eubulus* and *Sophronius*, in the Pamphlet, Call'd by the proud Name of

*CENSURA TEMPORUM.*

For the Month of September, 1708.

*I have heard the Check of my Reproach, and the Spirit of my Understanding causeth me to answer, Job 20. 3.*

*Suffer me that I may speak; and after that I have spoken, Mock on, Job 21. 3.*

*And through Covetousness shall they with feigned Words make Merchandise of you, 2 Pet. 2. 3.*

LONDON:

Printed, and Sold by J. Sowle, in White-Hart-Court in  
Gracious-Street, 1709.

Witney/m

C. 52. 42. 5438

YARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY  
FROM THE  
ANDREW PRESTON PEABODY  
FUND

Jan 31 1936

# Crucifixion and Canon

OF THE  
History of Writing under the Gospel  
DETECTED, &c.

Against the exceptions of an English Ignorance  
of the English language, and the want of a  
of the English language, and the want of a  
of the English language, and the want of a

CELESTIAL FORUM

For the Month of September, 1708.

For the Month of September, 1708.  
For the Month of September, 1708.  
For the Month of September, 1708.  
For the Month of September, 1708.

LONDON:  
Printed and sold by J. Smith, in the Strand in  
St. Dunstons Church, 1709.

# A D E F E N C E

Of the BOOK Entituled

*CERINTHUS* and *EBION*:

O R,

*The Heresy of Tything under the Gospel  
Detected, &c.*

*Scandal.* ‘ **T**hey enter it for Sacrilege, and say it’s a Performance scarce to be parallell’d for Rambling and Weakness of Argument; as defective in Grammar, as Logick; and the Language as foul, as the Reasoning false, P. 266.

‘ He has so wretchedly mis-represented, and so weakly and triflingly opposed the Argument of that Essay, that there needs no more than comparing his Remarks with them, to expose the Lightness of ’em, and very often not so much——  
‘ To begin then, he shews the Cloven-foot in the Preface, P. 269.

‘ And that’s the Case of all his Arguments and Objections; they stand confuted there (*viz.* in the 8th Section of the Essay) already; or else are so very contemptible, that they are not worth it:  
‘ As for instance; his Inference from his Adversary’s Assertion, that giving more than a Tenth, included a Tenth: which is, That he would open a Door for us, not only to give away our Tythe, but our All to the Priests, P. 35. This, in plain Terms, is so foolish, that ’tis only to be laugh’d at, and neglected, P. 274, 275.



*Answ.* This coming under the Head of *Scandal*, it is fit to set it together. And now when that is done, all in a manner's done that I have to do with it; for it lies so much out of my way, that one of their Oyster-Women wou'd raise more Matter out of such a parcel of Rhetorick, and handle it at another rate than I can do: for my Talent is not of that sort, so shall dismiss it on these civil terms, viz. *Valeat quantum valere potest*, Let it serve their Cause as much as it can.

*Criticism.* Soph. ' *Rudus indigestaque moles*, as the learned Author has it in his Preface.

*Eub.* ' The truth on't is, he has a very unlucky hand at Latin; he ventures, I think, upon five Scraps, and is out in all but one: ' There's his *Innocui omnes cultores numinis omnes*, p. 13. for *vers.* ' & *sic sine* (instead of *siccine*) *disputant Academici vestrates*, for ' Prose, are Curiosities of his own Fabrication, p. 21. But I forget my self; Criticism's as much out of our way, as Latin's out of his.

*Answ.* *Rudus* for *rudis* might perhaps be the Author's oversight, but he gave not *Innocui omnes*, &c. for Verse, any more than the other Quotation out of *Ovid*; he knew them to be both Fragments of Verse: But may not one use a Fragment of a Verse, without being bound to fill it up? Then he wou'd never use any; for he has an Aversion to Poetry. And as to *sic sine* for *siccine*, it is a gross Press-error; from which, the *Errata* at the End of their Book, shews they can't secure their own Works. So their taking notice of it in another's, looks little; whenas I think there are more than five Scraps of Latin in that Book; but he particularizeth (not so many) but three only: In all which the mistake of one Letter, if that, is all they can fairly charge upon the Author. Is not this trifling? But if it were more, what's this to the Matter; our Controversy with them is not about Latin or Logick, but the Divine Right of Tythes: the Author hath but little School-learning; and if they say none, he'll not differ with them about it: as little of that as they please.

But, why says *Eub.* he forgets himself; and that Criticism's much out of their way, who, by the Title of their Monthly Book, assume to themselves to be the Censurers of the Times when as a Censurer, and a Critick, have some resemblance; for a Critick is one that takes upon him to Censure or Judge of other Mens Words, Works or Actions, and a Censurer is the same; and so Criticism and Censurer are much the same thing; for Criticism is the Art of Censuring other Mens Words, Writings, or Actions; and this is the Art  
of



of a Censurer : therefore a Censurer without Criticism, is as much as to say a Censurer without Censure, or Critick without Criticism, or Judge without Judgment. Thus Essential is Criticism to a Censurer : and yet these Censurers say it's out of their way ; and impute it to Forgetfulness that they meddle with Criticism, and pretend to a good Judgment, but bad Memory. Yet, which is worst, the first that makes Criticism so far out of the way of profess'd Criticks, or who other he confesseth to, forgetting himself by the time he's well enter'd into the Discourse ; and missing his way in the beginning of his Journey, to what serves their Learning now ? one may run into Contradiction and Nonsense without it.

*History 266. Soph.* ' He hath found out the Epistle to the *Philippians*, ascrib'd to *Ignatius* to be really his ; and produc'd a Passage from it not to be seen in it, whosoever shall keep *Easter* with the *Jews*, &c. *Presf. p. 3.*

*Eub.* ' His *Epiphanius* and *Oecumenius* differ from our Copies. Our *Epiphanius* mentions not Tythes, *adv. Heres. L. 2. p. 9.* nor of *Serug's* passing from *Egypt* into *Greece* by *Inachus* ; instead of which, our *Epiphanius* makes *Inachus* Contemporary with *Moses*.

*Soph.* ' But what says *Oecumenius*, where he quotes him, *P. 24.*

*Eub.* ' Just as much of Tythes as *Epiphanius*, either in the place above, or in *L. 1. Ord. 8.* where our Author tells us (*P. 44.*) he makes Tenths one of his three Instances of Shadows and Images contained in the Law, &c. *P. 267.*

*Soph.* ' There are several Epistles extant of *St. Jerom.* to *St. Austin* ; but 'twas not convenient to tell us in which of them *St. Jerom.* calls Tything the Heresy of *Cerinthus* and *Ebion*.

In short, the place he wou'd make his advantage of, is in that long one which begins *tres Simul Epistolas*, where the Father speaks of *Cerinthus* and *Ebion*, and their mingling the Ceremonies of the Law with the Gospel ; but intimates nothing at all of Tythes, *P. 268.*

*Answ.* It no more concerns the Author whether that Epistle be *Ignatius's* or not, than all others that quote it. I shall give the words of the Passage, they say is not to be seen in it, in Latin ; that if they can make any other English out on't they may, *Viz. Si quis cum, Judais celebrat Pascha, aut Symbola festivitatis eorum recipit, Particeps est eorum qui dominum occiderunt & Apostolos ejus, &c.*

*Ignatii Epistola ad Philippenses prope finem impressa apud Geneva, Anno 1623.*

*Epipha, adv. Heres. lib. 2. p. 9.* is Mis-printed ; it shou'd be *lib. 1. p. 9.* then I thought, that, by *Serug's* passing from *Egypt* into *Greece*

by

by *Inachus*, was to be understood by what way he went thither, or by way of what Part on't he entred the Countries of *Greece*: and not that he went from *Egypt* into *Greece* by such a Man, we have no President for such a Mode of Speech, which wou'd be disagreeable to Common Sense; and besides, it seems as if their *Epiphanius* were out of his Reckoning in making *Inachus* Contemporary with *Moses* ( who was Born *An. Mu. 2433.* ) if we may believe *Dictionarium Etymologicum propriorum nominum*. Where it is said, *Inachus, primus Argivorum rex, qui Inacho fluvio nomen dedit, a quo Argivi ipsi Inachida appellati sunt, tota Peloponnesus Inachida dicta est; est & Inachium oppidum Peloponnesi, regnavit Inachus ann. 50. an. m. 2093.*

As to *Oecumenius* not mentioning *Tythes*, where he is quoted in *P. 24.* Who says he did? he is not quoted for that, but about Oaths, and outward Sacrifice; and Snake makes *Tythes* and Sacrifices relatives, and then if these Sacrifices be ended and ceas'd, *Tythes* are ceas'd and ended with them; for it is a general Rule of Relatives, if the one be, the other must needs be; and if the one be taken away, the other must also be taken away: Then we must either deny *Tythes*, or introduce Sacrifice; or oppose it that they are Relatives. So it will be an hard case for the Censurers and Snake, to agree which of them to do.

Then as to that Objection, that *Epiphanius* mentions not *Tythes*, *L. 1. Ord. 8.* where he is quoted, *P. 44.* to make them one of his three Instances of Shadows and Images contained in the Law. Differences about Quotations of those ancient Authors, may arise, from the difference in the Folio's of different Editions; but what is this to the Matter (or if it were a Press-Error) as long as the Thing is in some part of the Book or Author's Works: And as this Friend hath given notice in the Epistle to the Reader, that he has not read at large all the Authors he quotes, but goes upon Collections of credible Authors he has read, &c. How (if there was a Mistake) doth this affect his Ingenuity, which they tax, but shew their own Dis-ingenuity in so doing: And besides, we lay not the chief stress upon the Fathers, but wherein they agree with Truth we agree with them, and willingly quote them, to obviate a common Objection, and as false as common, of Novelty, to our Principles, tho' God hath had a People through Ages that have held the same: But the Principal Authority, we allow to the Holy Scriptures, and to the tryal of them, we submit our Doctrine; but not to any other Book as we quote, any further, than they agree with these.

And

And lastly, as to their Objection, That *Jerom* intimates nothing at all of Tythes. They own *Cerintus* and *Ebion's* mingling the Ceremonies of the Law with the Gospel; and this infers Tythes, which come into the Number of Legal Ceremonies; and is as much as the Author hath said where they quote him; save that *Jerom* in his Epistle to *Augustin*, calls this Commixtion the Heresy of *Cerintus* and *Ebion*. For which, see *Hieronimus Augustino*, fol. 121. *Hac ergo summas est questionis, immo sententia tua, ut post Evangelium Christi, bene faciant Judei credentes, Si Legis mandata custodiant: hoc est si Sacrificia offerant, qua obtulit Paulus si filios circumcidant, si Sabbatum servant, ut Paulus in Timotheo & omnes observare Judei. Si hoc verum est in Cerinthii & Ebionis heresi dilabimur: qui credentes in Christo propter hoc solum à Patribus anathematizati sunt, quod Legis ceremonias Christi Evangelio miscuerunt.*

*Soph.* ' Perhaps, — he design'd that Piece of History of Nu. 1.  
' his, &c. for a banter upon St. Paul's Assertion, that Levi paid  
' Tythes in Abraham, and if this was his meaning, — besides *Inspids.*  
' affronting the Holy Ghost; the Fact, if 'twere true, makes di-  
' rectly against him. P. 267.

*Soph.* ' Or if it were to be understood in the same Proper Sense Nu. 2.  
' as that of Christ; and *Melchisedec* were in the Primary Sense  
' he of whom it is witnessed that he Lives; then all the Advan-  
' tage the Quakers get by that, wou'd be, that *Melchisedec*, instead  
' of Christ, properly receives Tythes: and perhaps they had ra-  
' ther he should have them than Christ, P. 273.

*Eub.* ' Our Author's Argument here is just such a Wise one as Nu. 3.  
' this wou'd be: The worship of the true God was under the  
' Law confin'd to the Temple at Jerusalem; which Temple being  
' long since demolish'd, and the Worship of it abrogated, the true  
' God is not now to be worshipp'd at all, tho' the very Design of  
' the Gospel was to introduce a more pure and perfect Worship  
' of him, P. 275.

*Soph.* ' I confess, I think 'tis a Tally to the other, as it runs thus; Nu. 4.  
' God was pleas'd to assign the Priesthood a proper and conven-  
' nient Maintenance under the Legal Dispensation; but the Leviti-  
' cal Priesthood, and the Legal Dispensation being long since expir'd,  
' the Christian Priesthood is not to have this proper and conven-  
' nient Maintenance; tho' the Apostle tells us, Christ receives  
' Tythes; and tho' they were reckoned in the Apostolick and Pri-  
' mitive Times so far from being not equally due to the Christian  
' Priesthood, as they had been to the Levitical; that the Chri-  
' tians then thought it their Duty to add a great deal more to  
' the Maintenance of their Pastors, P. 276. *Answ.*



*Ans.* To save the trouble of re-transcribing (as I Answer) them, shall consider these Heads; every one under the same Number they are mark'd with, tho' they are so very insipid and silly, that few wou'd have taken notice of 'em.

*Nu. 1.* Perhaps he designed it not so, and then where's the Affront to the Holy Ghost? Is this the Way? to insinuate their Adversary's affronting the Holy Ghost, upon no better Ground than perhaps he designed it.

Then he saith, the Fact if it were true, makes directly against him (*i. e.* the Author) but as he hath chang'd the History from *Serug* to *Abraham*, the Fact is not true of the latter, and so it makes nothing against him, *p. 267.*

*Nu. 2.* Perhaps we had not rather have *Melchisedec* to have Tythes than Christ, and then all he hath said on this Head is blown away with a Breath.

'Tis plain that Perhaps, is an equal ballance to Perhaps, so all their Arguments of this Mood are vain, and foolish: and there remains one thing still which looks strange above the rest, *viz.* whence he shou'd conclude us so very great Lovers and Admirers of the Priests, as to prefer any of them to our Lord Jesus Christ, as his Argument imports, (if any thing,) which wou'd amount to Idolizing them; but tho' we are Lovers of their Persons, yet we must be excus'd as to this, *P. 273.*

*Nu. 3.* What he calls the Author's Argument here, is but a scrap on't discerpt from the rest, *viz.* That Tythes were taken away, is evident from *Acts 15.* And *Eub.* saith, That Temple-worship is long since Abrogated. So the difference between them cannot be wide here, if any at all; for the one means the same by taken away, the other doth by Abrogated.

And that Tythes were an essential Part of Temple-worship Snake will own; for he makes them the highest and chief Worship, &c. *Essay Sec. 6.* And *Eub.* defends it, *P. 271.* and grants in this Argument that they are Abrogated, in granting the Abrogation of that Worship whereof they were an Essential part. But yet to differ with the Author (reason or none) insinuates his Argument to be as ill-grounded, as if he shou'd infer from the Abrogation of Temple-worship, that God is not now to be worshipped at all. Which is very weak, for the Argument is from the taking away, or Abrogation, of that Worship, that it ought not to be taken up again. So Tythes being abrogated in the Abrogation of that Worship ought not to be taken up again. Now if he can shew us that something which was abrogated in that worship, is still

still in force, he does something; or else it must be concluded, that Tythes being then abrogated, are not now in force.

Then one wou'd wonder but that *Enb.* is so forgetful, P. 266. that he who holds Tythes to be the highest and chief, and most preferable Gospel-worship, P. 271. Shou'd tell us, the very Design of the Gospel was to introduce a more Pure and Perfect Worship of God, than the Temple-worship; for if his Argument be good, P. 271. the Gospel hath introduc'd no higher or more preferable Worship of God than Tythes: and they had those under the Law. What shall we say then? hath the Gospel miss'd of its very Design; or is not the most Pure and Perfect Worship of God, his highest and most preferable Worship? These Men may be Scholars, but are Blind concerning Religion, P. 275.

The Levitical Priesthood and Legal Dispensation being long since abrogated, and expir'd, proves the Abrogation of Tythes, which are no more to be restor'd and upheld now, than the rest of the Legal Dispensation and its Priesthood, with which they were disannulled. For after Christ hath disannulled and put an end to them, for Men to make a Law to restore, and uphold them still; is to act directly contrary to Christ; and in such a case we are to obey God rather than Man, when Man makes Laws contrary to his Laws, Enacting again what he hath Repeal'd; making that a Law, which he hath disannull'd and made None.

And what was then, a proper and convenient Maintenance for the *Levites*, may not be, nor is so now, for the Gospel-Ministers; for that it stands not upon the same foot of Moral Equity as the other, either in respect of Service, Number, or Deprivation; as the Author hath shewn p. 48. and the Argument will not hold, from that God was pleas'd to assign the Priesthood a proper and convenient Maintenance under the Legal Dispensation; that therefore it is his pleasure to assign the Priesthood an improper and inconvenient Maintenance under the Gospel-Dispensation, especially an unequal one.

Then as to Christ's receiving Tythes, it is denied, as the Author hath shewn, p. 29, and 30. therefore it makes nothing for Tythes in this sense, in which, at, before or since the time those words were spoken; neither Christ, nor any of his Ministers, ever receiv'd them: that the Scripture mentions.

And that they were reckon'd in the Apostolick and Primitive Times equally due to the Christian Priesthood, as they had been to the Levitical, &c. is groundless and false.

Acts 4.32, 34, 35. For in the Apostle's time ; at *Jerusalem*, and thereabouts, the Church had all things in common ; and as many as had Houses or Land, sold them, and laid down the Money at the Apostle's Feet ; and it was distributed to every Man, according as he had need.

Hieron. in vita Merc. Also the Church, gather'd by *Mark* at *Alexandra* in *Egypt*, follow'd the same Rule, having all things in common. *Philo Judæus*, a famous Author of that time, reporteth, that not only there, but in many other Provinces the Christians lived together in Societies, having all things in common.

In the Church at *Antioch* the Saints possessed, every Man his own Estate, and in *Galatia* and *Corinth*, where the Apostle order'd that Weekly Offerings for the Saints shou'd be made by every Man as God had blessed him ; and by these Offerings were all the Services and Needs of the Church supplied. And by the Example of these, the Course of Monthly Offerings succeeded in the next Age, not exacted, but freely given at the Bounty of every Man ; which were put into the hands of the Deacons.

Ast. 11.29. About the Year 304, some Lands begun to be given to the Church, and the Rents were brought into the Church's Treasury, Vide Synod. Gang. Can. 60. Tertull. Apol. cap. 39. and belong'd to the Church in common, and were distributed as other Offerings by the Deacons and Elders ; but the Bishops or Ministers medled not with it. Euseb. lib. 4. cap. 22.

Coun. Ant. c. 25. And when the Council at *Antioch*, Anno 340, finding that much fault had been among the Deacons, to whom it properly belong'd, Ordained that the Bishops might distribute the Goods of the Church ; they requir'd that they shou'd not take any part on't to themselves, or the use of the Priests, &c. that lived with them, unless Necessity did justly require it ; using the words of the Apostle, *Having food and rayment, be therewith content.*

It also appears from the Writing of *Chrysostom*, who lived about the Year 400, that there was not the least use or practice of the Payment of Tythes in those Ages.

Which fully detects the Censurer's Falshood, the Practice of the Saints in the Apostolick Primitive Times, declaring their Judgment. For this way of voluntary Contributions excludes Tythes, but especially their Community of Living doth it ; either as a Sacred Revenue, or Seperate Maintenance for the Christian Priesthood, or Act of Worship : For if so, it had not been lawful for the Apostles and Primitive Gospel-Ministers to have lived in common with the Church, or the Church with them ; but they ought to have separated the Tythes from the rest of their Substance, as the Priests Portion : And this not only for their Maintenance-sake, but also for the sake of God's Worship.

*Monkery.*



*Mockery.* *Soph.* 'He appeals to St. *Jerom*, St. *Austin*, St. *Chrysostom*; but did not think it worth while to set down Book or Page, because he wou'd not fore-stall his Reader's industry. There are several Epistles extant of St. *Jerom* to St. *Austin*; but 'twas not convenient to tell us in which of them St. *Jerom* calls Tything the Heresy of *Cerinthus* and *Ebion*, for fear his learned and pretty Title-page should suffer by it, P. 267.

*Soph.* 'Are we to trace his Learning any lower? p. 269.

*Soph.* 'But he's a Plain-dealer, and can make as bold with the Patriarchs when they stand in his way, as with other people, p. 20. he makes Heathens of them, p. 274.

'At parting—we may desire our Author to read over, and lay to heart that excellent Sermon of St. *Austin*—about paying Tythes, n. 219. *Erasmus's* Edition, p. 276.

*Ans.* To this the Scriptures have foretold us, that there shou'd come Mockers in the last times, walking after their own ungodly Lusts; and indeed there is a Vein of it runs through most of their work, which is too light and frothy; and carries such an Air of Pride and Scorn in it, as is altogether unsuitable to a Religious Controversy. 2 Pet. 3. 3.  
Jud. 18.

The Reader may strange to see the last Paragraph, which looks like a civil parting, set under this Head of *Mockery*; but as they deny the Author to be a Schollar, and yet direct him to read, as he supposeth, a Latin Sermon, they cannot be sincere in both; for either in the first, they thought not as they said, or they mock him in this.

Having thus far got through the Spume and Froth of their Learning, we shall now come to a tryal of their Reasoning in course as it lies.

*Eub.* 'St. *Jerom's* Opinion about Tythes appears very plain in his Book *de Vita Clericorum*; his Words are these: *Si autem ego pars domini sum, & funiculus hereditatis ejus: nec accipio partem inter ceteras tribus, sed quasi Levita & Sacerdos vivo de decimis: & altari serviens altaris oblatione sustentor*, p. 268. 1709  
18

*Ans.* Supposing this genuine, will they submit to the like Deprivation with the Levites? else how can they say *nec accipimus partem inter ceteras tribus*? And if not, how have they the like title to Tythes? And if Tythes be here understood in a proper sense, so must Altar, Oblation, and Altar-service, be; which wou'd bring in Judaism; and if not, what is this to Tythes in the Priest's sense?

1. Tho' the Fathers might use the word *Tythes*, yet they did it Exemplarily, as *Cajetan* interprets them; for that the Example of

the *Jews* might have an exemplary force in Persuasion ; but they insisted only on the Morality of it, that People shou'd exercise Humanity, Hospitality, Mercy, and distribute freely to the Necessities of the Saints, &c. For they spake in Exhortation, by way of Allusion and Resemblance, which the Christian Offerings had to the *Jews*. And this Interpretation is confirmed by the Practice of the Saints in those times, and may serve as a Key to the right understanding of the Fathers ; as may also this.

2. That they spake not of compulsory ceremonial Tythes, but of free Gift, and voluntary Offerings ; not exacted, or the quantity determin'd, but freely given at the Bounty of every Man. For *Tertullian*, in his Apology, cap. 39. speaking of their Offerings, says, Every one puts to it some indifferent thing, at a Month, Day, or when he will, or if he will, or if he can ; for none is compelled, but brings it of his own accord ; these are, as it were, the Pledges of Charity ; and he shews how they were disposed of. And *Cyprian* after him, in the next Century, speaks of the Monthly Divisions given to the Ministers out of these. *Cypr. Epist.* 27, 34, 36, and 66.

3. So it is also evident, that the Fathers spake not of Priest's Tythes, which was their peculiar Part or Portion only ; but that out of which, all the Needs and Services of the Church were supplied ; Especially the Poor's, of whom, saith *Jerom*, we interpret Tythes and First-fruits their Possession.

*Jerom on  
Mal. 3.*

Item. *Jerom in Epist. & ponitur* 16. *quest. 2. cap. quicquid.* Whatsoever the Clergy have, are the Poor's Goods. Now will these Men stand to *Jerom's* Opinion about Tythes, or *Bernard's* in *Sermone* ? *Simon Peter* said to *Jesus*, cap. 17. Surely, the Poor's Patrimony is the Church's Means ; and it is stol'n from them. — Whatsoever the Ministers and Stewards, and not verily Lords and Possessors, take more than Food and Rayment. Who is it then that rob and starve, and undoe the Poor ? who make them wretched, and miserable, whilst they riot it in their Goods and Patrimony. Do they not consider, that he that oppresseth the Poor, reproacheth his Maker : but he that honoureth him, hath Mercy on the Poor.

*Prov. 14.  
31.*

*Eub. Ibid.* ' Our Author has the Modesty to deny, Tythes were reckoned due by any of the Fathers of the first Six Centuries, except *Origen* and *St. Ambrose*, P. 45. How false this is, will easily appear from the Tenth Sect. of the Essay—and by Bishop *Fell* in his Notes upon the Passage of *St. Cyprian*, in his Book, *De Unit. Eccl. at nunc de Patrimonio nec decimus damus*, &c.

I neither have, nor am concern'd to have these Books ; as he hath made no Quotations from them. Besides, any Argument he can draw from the Primitive Fathers, is already obviated ; and what-ever any particular Man might hold in his Judgment somewhat-uncertainly, we cannot without great Breach of Charity, censure, that any Number of the Primitive Christians, did believe Tythes to be Due by Divine Right, or by the Law of God, seeing they are not found in the Practice of Paying them : this our Adversaries must either prove, or they will never make the sensible part of Mankind believe that those holy Souls held one thing and practis'd another.

*Soph. Ibid.* ' He says, Tythes were not established by any General Council for 1200 Years, *P. 45.*

*Eub.* ' Nor Worshipping God neither, and is not this an Evidence they had a higher Date than General Councils, and higher Authority.

*Ans.* To say that Tythes were not established by any General Council for 1200 Years, if they were never so establish'd is confus'd and Nonsensical : And it is the same to say it of worshipping God ; for such saying imports, That the thing spoken of (whether Tythes or Worship) was sometime establish'd by a General Council : and Tythe has been so establish'd ; but never worshipping God. So to give this in as a Parallel Case to the other, is a Fallacy ; and to as much sense as to say, it was so long before such a thing was done, which was never done.

It is to be observed too here ; That *Eub.* speaks of Tythes and Worship as two distinct Things : and in *p. 271.* he Argues, that Tythes is the highest Worship : So the one is a flat Contradiction to the other ; If we take him according to *p. 268.* his pretended Answer is but an impertinent Nonsensical shew of an Answer only, as above is proved, or if we take him according to *p. 271.* The Quotation and Answer will stand thus.

*Quota.* Worshipping God was not establish'd by a General Council for 1200 Years, *p. 45.*

*Ans.* Nor Worshipping God neither. It is granted, God's Worship hath an higher Date and Authority than General Councils ; but it doth not follow so of Tythes, and all other things not establish'd by any General Council ; that they have a higher Date and Authority than General Councils.

*Eub. Ibid.* ' Besides several very considerable Provincial Councils, within that time have asserted the Divine Right of Tythes, and regulated Abuses that related to them ; and Regulation supposeth the thing regulated, already established. *Ans.*



*Ans.* But he particularizeth none of them; Is this because he wou'd not forestall his Reader's Industry? p. 267. But tho' I have none to present him with that concerns Tythes; yet one I have concerning the Gospel-Ministers maintenance, viz. The 4th Council of *Carthage*, consisting of 214 Bishops. *An.* 436.

*Cap.* 51. A Clergyman, although instructed in the Word of God, must get his living with a Trade.

*Cap.* 52. Let a Clergyman get Food and Rayment by some petty Trade or Husbandry, without hindrance of his Office.

*Cap.* 53. All Clergymen must learn both petty Trades and Literature, which are able to Work.

*Cap.* 15. That a Bishop have Vile or Cheap Household-Furniture, and a Poor Table and Food; and seek Authority of his Dignity by Faith, and deserts of Life.

*Cap.* 16. That he read not the Books of Heathen; and of Hereticks only for Necessity and the Time.

This was a Provincial Council, approved by Pope *Leo* the Third.

And shews clearly; that then the Gospel-Ministers Maintenance was not by Tythe, and that Tythes were not reckon'd equally due to the Christian Priesthood, as they had been to the Levitical: And that the Christians then thought it not their Duty to add a great deal more to the Maintenance of their Pastors, p. 276.

*Eub.* 'Can this Writer shew at what time after the Apostles time Divine Right of Tythes came first to be universally received in the Church?—'Till he does this, that General Councils took no notice on't, is only a strong Argument that it was uncontested, p. 269.

*Ans.* Even this over-turns the Divine Right of Tythes, that it was not received in the Church in the time of the Apostles; as his Query implicitly grants, by saying at what time after the Apostles, &c. which is only an inquiring at what time that was, which never was: For to this Day, the Divine Right of Tythes was never universally received in the Church; and it must needs be uncontested in General Councils, whil'st it was unproposed or thought of: to, or by them.

*Eub.* 'He's for dropping Sacrilege, and says, it may be done without any inconvenience at all, because it properly signifies Stealing holy Things; and Stealable Things are such as have of themselves no intrinsic Holiness: and yet it were endless to reckon up all the places in Scripture where God declares such Things holy. *Exod.* 29, &c. p. 269.

*Ans.*

*Ans.* The title of the *Cap.* he quotes, is, the Sacrifice and Ceremonies of consecrating the Priests, &c. Now if he can prove that God hath no where in Scripture ever call'd any thing Holy, but what was intrinsically Holy; then it must be owned his Instances in the room of Consecration and the Oyl, &c. do his cause some Service; but if God have called things Holy in Scripture; which had only a Typical or Ceremonial Holiness; then what he hath said, amounts to nothing at all that concerns the Argument: he might just as well have let it alone.

*Soph.* 'One word to his intrinsick Holiness. What do's he think  
' of the Person of a Saint? Is not his Holiness intrinsick? in such  
' a Sense as a Creature is said to be so? and at the same time is  
' not his Person a Stealable thing?—To this let me add that our  
' Saviour tells the Devil sometimes catches away that which is  
' sown in the Heart, *Mat.* 13. And is not that which is said there  
' to be sown intrinsically Holy? *P.* 270.

*Ans.* Here this *Sophomor* hath reduc'd his Friends endless Instances to Two; of which, but One concern Mankind; for the other is the Devil's, if it be Sacrilege. So if we Steal no Saints, we keep clear of Sacrilege; but they are all in God's hand, and no Man can Steal, or hide from him, as Thieves do what *Deut.* 33. they Steal from the Owners. Christ's Sheep are the Saints, and 3. he saith, *My Father which gave them me, is greater than all: and none is able to pluck, or steal them, out of my Fathers hand.* For the word *Joh.* 10. *rapere*, which signifies to steal, is here used: and is the same which 29. is used, *Mat.* 13. 19. and there it is translated to steal, here to pluck; that which is said there to be sown, is the Word of God: But can the Devil steal the Word of God in a proper literal Sense, or the Birds of the Air devour it; for the Text as much proves *Mat.* 13. the one as the other. But these Men are Blind; and see not what 19. Confusion and Blasphemy ensueth; from a perverse Interpretation of Parables and Allegory's; by which means, they seek to uphold their Notion of Sacrilege, whereby they wou'd insinuate, that a Man's with-holding his Tythes, which is his own, and so no Theft at all; is a greater Sin than robbing the Poor, which, if Theft be distinguishable, is the worst of Theft. But what they have said upon this Head serves only to shew there is nothing to be said for it; so as to charge it upon a Man, save in the Case of Saints stealing: which is Impracticable.

*Eub. Ibid.* 'He would represent the Paying of Tythes as only  
' an Act of Charity, &c. And to this end Objects, *p.* 8. that Tythes  
' were given as well to the Stranger, the Fatherless and Widow,  
' as

‘ as to the Levite, who had but his Share in common with them.  
 ‘ But first, if this were true, it wou’d only hold so of every third  
 ‘ Years Tythes.

*Answ.* And a good Step too; But whilst they uphold Tythes, will they allow one Third to the Poor, &c. under the specious pretence of Charity and Alms, from whom they first got the Tythe into their Hands, in Trust for them; which Trust they have wickedly violated, and jostled out the Poor (whose Names they made use on to get Tythes by, at first) from any Share therein? Will they, I say, allow them an equal Share with themselves in the Tythe of every Third Year? and as they now claim a right from the Jewish Example, they cannot in reason deny it: And why but in the Tythe of every Third Year only?

*Eub. Ibid.* For the Text is express; ‘ At the End of three Years  
 ‘ thou shalt bring forth all the Tythe of thine Increase the same  
 ‘ Year, V. 28.

*Answ.* This shews, that in the Triennial Tythe the Poor, &c. had an equal Right with the Levite. But do’s it prove that they had no Right in the Tythe of the other two Years? This is the Point he brings it to prove: and it is nothing to the purpose. The poor Stranger, and then to be sure the Native Poor, were to rejoyce in all the good Things of *Israel*. The Tythe given to the Poor was an Hallowed Thing; and the Levite was among the Poor, which was God’s Ordinance, or that which the Lord said should  
 Deut. 26. not cease out of the Land; for which there is as strict a Command  
 11. 13. as for the Levite.  
 15. 11.

*Eub. Ibid.* ‘ Here is a peculiar Reason given not common to the  
 ‘ Lèvite with the Stranger, &c. because he hath no Part nor In-  
 ‘ heritance with thee; and this Reason the very same why God  
 ‘ had before assigned Tythes; as may be seen at large, *Deut.* c. 18.  
 ‘ v. 20, 21, 22, 23, 24. 26.—And therefore the Stranger, &c.  
 ‘ is so far from being entituled to Tythes equally, or by the same  
 ‘ Tenure with the Levite, by being mention’d with him, that his  
 ‘ Claim is, in the same place, plainly distinguished from the other’s  
 ‘ Pretensions.

*Answ.* It looks as if his Bible differ’d as strangely from our’s, as his *Epiphanius*; for our’s mentions nothing of Tythes where he quotes it—nor of the Reason of their Grant: instead of which, our Bible makes but 22 Verses in *Deuteronomy*, chap. 18. and he makes 26. P. 267.

Then there is another Reason given, why God assign’d them Tythes; as peculiar to the Levites as this he mentions, and not common



common to them with the Stranger, &c. viz. for the Service which they serve, even the Service of the Tabernacle of the Congregation. Numb. 18. 21.

Now it is to be observ'd, that as both those Reasons were peculiar to the Levites, and not common to them with the Stranger, &c. so neither with the Christian Priesthood (as he calls it) who have no more than the Stranger, &c. any Claim to Tythes upon account of either of these Reasons, viz. either because of the Deprivation, or Office: For they are neither depriv'd of their Inheritance, or charged with the Service of the Tabernacle of the Congregation: any more than the Stranger, &c. And therefore if one of these Reasons be sufficient to prove the Stranger, &c. is far from being entituled to Tythes equally with the Levites, tho' mention'd in the Grant or Appropriation with them. Surely both of them must be sufficient to prove that the Christian Priesthood are farther from being entituled to Tythes equally with the Levites, who were never mentioned in the Grant or Appropriation with them. So he must either own his Reason against the Stranger, Poor, &c. to be Insufficient and Defective, or quit his Claim to Tythe from the Levites President, and then we have done with Tythes under the Law; which is upon the Matter all the Plea the *Jus Divinum* Men have for Tythe.

The Stranger, &c. being expressly named in the Grant of Tythes, had a Title to them, derived from God's Gift; which is so far the same with the Levites Title; tho' some of the Reasons of the Gift might be peculiar to the latter. So our Adversary's use the words equally, and by the same tenure, only as a Subterfuge; for if the Stranger, &c. had a good true title to Tythe, what Injury is it to it: That the Levites Title was in something distinguishable from theirs; but it is plain they had such a Title to them: and that the Christian Priesthood had not, not being mentioned in the Grant; or implied in it. For how do they succeed the Levites who received Tythe, but were not Priests?

But this Reason, because he hath no Part or Inheritance with thee, *Eub.* saith, is the very same why God at first assigned the Levites Tythe, as may be seen at large, *Deut.* c. 18. v. 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26. What then? Is the first Assignment of Tythes to be seen at large in these Verses, and yet Tythe is never nam'd in them, nor any such Verses as the last three to be found in the Chapter.

*Soph.* 'Twas so largely set out before, *Deuter.* 18. that no Mistake but a wilful one, cou'd be made about the Matter here, p. 271.

*Ans.* What can he mean by this? is *Deuter. c. 18.* before *Deuter. c. 18.* these Men are not much read in the Scripture; whatever they are in Heathen Authors.

*Eub.* He reproaches the Author of the Essay with making Tythes the highest Worship—But till he proves that worshipping God with our Substance is not the highest Worship, and that Tythes is not a part expressly requir'd of that Substance,—The intrinsic Value of our Possessions is certainly more than that of our Words; and the more valuable that is, which we part with in Service to God, the greater Testimony—it is of our Devotion to him,—p. 271.

*Ans.* As to this last part, have they not forgot the Widows mite here? *Mark 12. 12.*

Heb. 9.

And the Determination of the first part depends upon this single Question, which ought to be no Question among Christians; viz. Whether Legal-Service, or Gospel-Worship, ought to be esteem'd the highest? The first consisted in Carnal Offerings and Sacrifices: and Tythes was a Part expressly requir'd. The second in Spiritual Offerings and Sacrifices; which is worshipping God in Spirit and in Truth; and Tythes are no part of that Worship, nor requir'd by any Gospel Precept.

The Priests say, the First, (in which they give the Law the Preference to the Gospel) is the highest Worship.

We say the Second, for the Worship which consists in Carnal Offerings and Sacrifices is not the Worship which Christ establish'd under the Gospel; but the Worship which Christ establish'd under the Gospel is the highest Worship. Therefore Serving God with our Substance is not the highest Worship.

*Eub.* Saith, the Intrinsic Value of our Possessions is certainly more than that of our Words. And *Snake*, That worshipping God with our Substance, is as much preferable to verbal Praises, as Deeds are more than Words. *Self. 6.*

*Ans.* So Ignorant are these Priests (as well as in Scripture) in Gospel-Worship that they take it to be nothing but Words.

But Gospel-Worship is Spiritual-Worship, which is Heavenly and Angelical Worship; and by how much the Spirit is more excellent and noble than the Body, or Heaven than Earth; by so much is Spiritual-Worship more excellent and noble than Legal-Worship. But these reputed Gospel-Ministers know nothing of Spiritual-Worship, it is a Mystery to them; they can make nothing but Words on't.

*Soph.*

*Soph.* ' Can he perceive no difference between those Offerings that were to go to the Maintenance of the Priest, and those that figuratively represented a future perfect and adequate Oblation and Sacrifice, p. 271.

*Ans.* Tythes, as well as the rest of the Jewish Offerings, figuratively represented a future perfect Oblation and Sacrifice; by whose Coming, and Sacrifice as well Tythes as the rest were disannulled and ended. Is God worshipped by the Priests Bellies, or are these two so near allied, that Tythes must be both the highest and most preferrable Worship, and also the Priest's Maintenance? Two things he would insinuate here; 1. That Tythes did not typifie Christ: 2. That they were to go to the Maintenance of the Priests. Both which are False.

*Eub.* ' One wou'd think he cou'd not; for thus he argues: If First-fruits and Tythes be due according to the very letter of the Law, which he quotes *Origen* to prove, and to be Paid precisely and strictly, as himself says, in such Manner and Method as is commanded in Scripture; Then he introduces *All the Jewish Offerings, Sacrifices, and Ceremonies*; to be continued amongst us; which amounts to a Rejection or Denial of the one Offering and Sacrifice of Christ.

*Soph.* — ' Let him prove, if he can, as well as assert, that Paying Tythes precisely and strictly, in such Manner and Method as is commanded in Scripture, is introducing *All the Jewish Offerings, Sacrifices, and Ceremonies*, p. 272.

*Ans.* He saith not, *All the Jewish Offerings, &c.* but having enumerated all the Jewish Offerings, &c. with the Payment of Tythes according to Scripture manner and method required. He argu'd such Payment, (which *Snake* insisted on) would introduce *All these Jewish Offerings, &c.* which he had there enumerated; and which were annex'd to, or connected with the Payment of Tythe after the Scripture manner; but they like Men, have turned *All these*, into *All the Jewish Offerings, &c.* and bid the Author prove, as well as assert, what he has not asserted. Can these Men be honest, that treat us thus with Trick and Falshood?

*Eub.* — ' This Adversary, he says, finding Eternity or Immortality, imply'd in *Vers. 8.* takes it in a proper Sense, to intend Christ to be the Tythe Receiver literally; not considering that in *v. 3.* there is Immortality and Eternity ascrib'd to *Melchisedec*, was he therefore Christ? As if it follow'd, that because the Type and Antitype do not Answer in every respect or particular (which



if they did, they could not be such) therefore they do not answer in those things wherein they are compar'd, p. 272.

*Ans.* This is not to the Purpose; the Matter here in question is, whether Christ receive Tythes in Heaven literally; that is, whether he receive now in Heaven the Tythes of our Corn and Cattle, and other Increase and Fruits of the Earth in a proper literal Sense: or the place is an Allegory. The First is absurd, and the Second do's not Support the *Snake's* Inference, that then Christ hath not abrogated Tythes; for a Scriptural Allegory is the representation of some Mystical or Spiritual thing by another, mentioned in Scripture, and is, when by the things done under the Law, the Mysteries of the Gospel are signified. So it is a Sentence that must be understood otherwise than the literal Interpretation shews.

And this cannot be spoken of the Gospel-Ministers receiving Tythes; 1. Because it speaks not of literal Tythe; 2. Because it was spoken in the Present Tense, he receiveth them; at a time when the Ministers of the Gospel receiv'd none. So this will make nothing for the Priest's Tythes.

*Eub.* You may see another of his Paraphrases upon *Heb. 7.* where he strives to confound the Commandment, to take Tythes of the People, v. 5. with the Law of a Carnal Commandment, dis-annulled, &c. v. 16. 18. But the Antithesis, v. 16. spoils it all; for the Power of an Endless Life is that which is opposed to the Law of a Carnal Commandment, p. 273.

*Ans.* The Commandment to take Tythes of the People, was a Part of the Law, whereby the Aronical Priesthood was made, the Scripture calls the Law of a Carnal Commandment; dis-annulled, &c. and opposeth to it the Power of an Endless Life; after which, Christ is said to be made a Priest for ever; greater than *Aaron*, and all the High-Priests of the Law, which of necessity is changed, the Priesthood being changed; and that change explained by the word dis-annulled.

But is the Power of an Endless Life's being opposed to the Law of a Carnal Commandment, any Argument to prove that the Commandment to take Tythes of the People belong'd not to it, or was no Part of the Law of a Carnal Commandment. This is what he brings it to prove; but it is nothing to his Purpose.

*Eub.* And that Power of an Endless Life, plainly refers to the Similitude in the former Verse, 'Tis obvious that the Eternity of Christ's Priesthood, as typify'd by *Melchisedec's*, is that where- in the Apostle opposeth it to the Levitical; what's this to Tythes? This eternal Priesthood was after the Order of *Melchisedec*; and

\* and did not *Melchisedec* receive Tythes? and does not the Anti-type of *Melchisedec* receive them?

Ans. *Melchisedec* once, but Christ not once, literally; He receives the Dominion of which they were a Sign, the Tenth being Symbolical to the best, or richest. But what's this to Tythes in the Priests Sense?

The Opposition here must be either between *Melchisedec's* Typical Priesthood, and *Levi's*, or between Christ's Priesthood and *Levi's*; and which soever Priesthood is opposed to the Levitical, is preferr'd before it, and is that which is to take place of it, and to endure for ever. Suppose the first, and it for ever excludes the Gospel, and its Priesthood; but if the Opposition be between the Levitical Priesthood and Christ's, and the Scope of this Chapter to shew our *cedere Lex Evangelio debeat*, why the Law ought to give place to the Gospel; and they be true Gospel-Ministers; then as Christ nor his Apostles, nor any of his Ministers ever took or desir'd Tythes that we read on in Scripture; so neither ought they to do but like Gospel-Ministers, be content with a Gospel-Maintenance.

*Soph.* ' Our Tythe-hater has the Confidence to say, his Adversary owns the Apostles never named Tythes, and then as confidently infers they never preached them. One would wonder how this could come from him, after he had read the 9th Section of the Essay; nay, and had just before been trying his Skill upon his Adversary's Proofs, from *Heb. 7. p. 274.*

Ans. But does he not tell where his Adversary says it, viz. Sect. 9. p. 114. that it was great Prudence in the Apostles not to name Tythes, not to add Oyl to the Flame, &c. — and if they nam'd them not, they preach'd them not; so the Inference is Self-evident. Where's then the Confidence the *Sophomor* talks of? Is't that, when the Author had been just before considering, *Heb. c. 7.* where the Apostle so often names Tythes? he should tell us, his Adversary says, the Apostles nam'd not Tythes (though he do say so) as if he should say any thing contrary to Scripture. What for a Wonder's this!

*Soph. Ibid.* ' He makes Heathens of the Patriarchs.

In this Page there is mention made of a general Apostacy which was then in the World; and if the *Hebrews* at their calling out of it, retain'd some things sprung up therein, which they had learn'd, and were nurs'd up in among the Heathen, who worshipped strange Gods, yet this does not make them Heathens; who were call'd out from among them, and worshipped.

shipped only, the only true God : tho' their Service of him might in some things, as their Sacrifices and Altars, &c. resemble the manner of the other's Service of their Idols. So his Inference, that the Author makes Heathens of them, is like most of his other, false and foolish.

*Eub. Ibid.* ' He's for Root and Branch-work ; for pulling up the Priesthood with the Tythes, because he cannot part them.

*Answ.* But the Question between the Priesthood and Tythes, is, which is the Root, and which the Branches. It seems indeed by the Order of the Discourse, as if the Priesthood were the Root, and Tythes the Branches : but this hangs not well together, for the Branches are ever produc'd from the Root ; but Tythes are not produc'd from the Priesthood, but from the Laity. These are the industrious Bees that make the Honey ; those the Drones that eat it.

On the other hand, if we make Tythes the Root, and the Priesthood the Branches ; for it is Tythes produces this Priesthood, and not the Priesthood Tythes ; then their terrene Production wou'd be an Impeachment to their Divinity ; and shew these *terra filii* (followers of the way of *Balaam*, who loved the Wages of Unrighteousness) to be none of Christ's Ministers.

2 Peter 2.  
15.  
Jude 11.

But further, by making the Priesthood and Tythes inseparable, he denies the Apostolick Priesthood, and their Successors in the Gospel-Ministry for several Hundred Years ; and that of all the Martyrs, and Protestants in Popish Countries, ever since the Reformation, and at this day ; all who never had or have Tythes, as the Priesthood of the Protestants in *France, Piedmont, Italy, &c.*

*Eub.* ' That Tythes were taken away, says he, is evident from *Acts* 15. 28, 29. for it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and the Apostles not to continue any Ceremonies of the Law among the Believers, nor to lay upon them any greater Burthen than these few necessary things ; so not the Burthen of Tythes ; for the Argument is of legal Ceremonies. A shrewd Conclusion ! Was Abstaining from Fornication then a legal Ceremony ? p. 275.

*Answ.* Well ; The Argument of Necessity must be either of legal Ceremonies, or Fornication ; for the Apostle's Answer treats only of these two ; and the Censurers deride the first, by which they fix on the latter, or reject the Text wholly.

But was the Question concerning Fornication then, which made so great a Dissention in the Church, as caused *Paul* and *Barnabas, &c.* to go up to *Jerusalem*, to the Apostles and Elders about it ? And what if the Apostles saw fit, as it appears they did, to caution  
in



in the same Epistle, those, who from among the Gentiles, were turned to God, against Fornication? Does this prove, that the Dissention in the Church was about Fornication? or that this was so difficult a Point to determine, as requir'd the Decision of a General Council.

The Question was concerning some Doctrine (as Circumcision after the manner of *Moses*, &c.) which certain Men who came down from *Judea*, taught the Gentile Converts, was necessary to Salvation, v. 1. But is it likely they shou'd teach them, that Fornication was necessary to Salvation? Or if they had, that it shou'd ever so far take place in the Church, as to occasion this Dissention.

The Question was, concerning what the Apostle *Peter* terms a *Yoke upon the Necks of the Disciples*, which, saith he, *neither we nor our Fathers were able to bear*, v. 10. Was this Fornication? how do these Men understand the Scripture? That because Fornication was not a legal Ceremony, therefore Circumcision was not one? Or because Fornication is named in the Apostle's decisive Epistle, therefore the Subject-matter of its decision is not of legal Ceremonies: tho' the Doctrine that made the Dissention in the Church was; except they were *circumcised after the manner of Moses*, they could not be saved, v. 1. And the Apostles themselves give this account of the Cause of that Epistle, viz. *Forasmuch as we have heard, that certain who went out from us, have troubled you with words, subverting your Souls, saying, Ye must be circumcised, and keep the Law, to whom we gave no such Commandment*, &c. v. 24.

So 'tis plain, the Argument which made the difference, was about legal Ceremonies, and (those few excepted for the time) the Apostles determin'd against them: and Tythes were among those Ceremonies which were excluded by this decision, as well as any of the rest; and so are as much excluded as the other.

*Eub. Ibid.* ' Again, Was the end of Tythes, as we observ'd before, very distinct and different from the end of those legal Ceremonies, which were not continued by the Apostles?

*Soph.* ' Can he perceive no difference between those Offerings that were to go to the Maintenance of the Priest, and those that Figuratively represented a future perfect Oblation and Sacrifice? p. 271.

*Ans.* But what, or where, are those Offerings they speak of? The Argument we are upon, is of legal Offerings, and Sacrifices; and till they can shew us that some of them were not Typical, and others the Priest had no Maintenance out of; we deny their Distinction.

For

For Tythes, as well as the other Offerings, &c. were Typical of Christ; the Tenth part Symbolical to the best, or Fulness.

Numb. 18. 28. Again, if Tythes had been the Priest's Maintenance (which they were not any more than an Heave-offering out of them) the Argument from thence, is of no more force to continue them under the Gospel, than for the Continuance of all the other Jewish Offerings, and Sacrifices: for the Priest's Maintenance was assign'd out of all the hallowed things of *Israel*. So by a Parity of Reason, we must either continue them altogether, or part with them altogether.

Numb. 18. 21. But Tythes were the Levite's Maintenance. And who are the Levites under the Gospel, whose Worship requires no Porter's Work; therefore *cessante Opere, cessant Mercedis*; the Work ceasing, the Wages cease with it.

And Christ the Antitype and Substance being come, the Reason and End of them all, Tythes, Offerings, and Sacrifices, is at an End; so therefore shou'd they be too.

Benj. Lindley.

So this plain Argument which made the Difference was about legal Ceremonies and (as I now say) the Tythes were among those Ceremonies which were excluded by the Decree, as well as any of the rest.

For, what was the end of Tythes, as we observed before, very distinct and different from the end of legal Ceremonies, which were not continued by the Apostles.

2dly, Can we perceive no difference between those Offerings that were so to the Maintenance of the Priest, and those that were not? Can we perceive no difference between those Offerings that were so to the Maintenance of the Priest, and those that were not?

3dly, Can we perceive no difference between those Offerings that were so to the Maintenance of the Priest, and those that were not? Can we perceive no difference between those Offerings that were so to the Maintenance of the Priest, and those that were not?

220

12

17:6-18